DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 024 386 JC 680 447

By- Roberts, Clarence W.
Fringe Benefits in Public Junior Colleges.
American Association of Junior Colleges, Washington, D.C.
Pub Date Oct 68
Note- 6p.
Journal Cit- Junior College Journal; v39 n2 October 1968
EDRS Price MF-$0.25 HC-$0.40
Descriptors- *College Faculty, Faculty Recruitment, *Fringe Benefits, *Insurance Programs, *Junior Colleges, *Retirement, Salaries

To recruit and retain qualified faculty in competition with industry and government, junior colleges have been improving their fringe benefit programs. This study examines the benefits currently available at 389 colleges and shows their order of frequency and their relation to college age, size, and location. The most frequent benefit is the retirement program. The next most frequent ones are health insurance, travel pay, sick leave, secretarial help, and major medical insurance. Next come faculty parking, social security, leave without pay, life insurance, and leave with pay. Less frequent and only irregularly available are a faculty club, discount purchases through the college, tuition-free enrollment for families, faculty housing, privileges for retired faculty, moving expenses, personal loans, mortgage loans, and availability of college facilities for private use. Further research is suggested on (1) which benefits faculty members most want, (2) the attraction of non-institutional factors (e.g., climate), and (3) whether these findings apply to administrators as well as to faculty. (HH)

EDO 24386

FRINGE BENEFITS IN PUBLIC JUNIOR COLLEGES

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

S DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE
RSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS
ATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION
SITION OR POLICY.

A Recent Survey Shows Which Benefits Are Offered Most Often; Retirement Leads the List

By Clarence W. Roberts

The recruitment and retention of qualified faculty members are two of the major problems faced by junior college administration today. One lever currently used by administrators in solving these problems is fringe benefits.

For many years, the problems of recruiting and retaining faculty did not exist because education could always fill its ranks with what Tickton has described as "dedicated people, men and women who would rather be educators than anything else." [1] This situation has changed, or, at least, is changing. Thus, the public junior colleges, as they continue their rapid increase in both size and number, find themselves in greater competition for personnel with private employment and government, fields in which union pressure and basic social policy decisions have brought about changes in economic compensation. One way these changes were manifested was in the form of fringe benefits.

As fringe benefits have become increasingly important, periodic reviews have been made within private employment, government, and senior colleges and universities that facilitate comparison and improvement of their fringe benefits. This study, based on a recommendation of the Administrative Committee of the AAJC in 1958 and 1959,[2] provides the same data to public junior college administrators.[3]

The information for this study was obtained by sending a questionnaire to the chief administrators of the 522 public junior colleges as determined from the 1966 *Junior College Directory*. Replies were received and analyzed from 389 (74 per cent) of these institutions.

JC 680 447

It was found that there were twenty different fringe benefits in existence in the junior college population. Some appeared with frequency while others were in existence in only a very few schools. Table I presents a summary of all benefits showing the rank order of their existence and percentage of junior colleges that made each available.

Most Frequently Found Benefits

The benefit that ranked number one in terms of frequency with which it existed in the junior college was the availability of a retirement program. More than 99 per cent of the schools reporting offered this benefit to their faculty members.

In the majority of schools, this plan was some form of a state retirement system that covered either all public employees or just teachers. Few institutions (14 per cent) offered their faculty members a choice of more than one retirement plan. Those institutions that did offer a choice used a self-administered plan or the TIAA-CREF plan. Participation in some type of plan was mandatory for nearly all faculty members and very few had to wait past the opening of school to enroll. All faculty members were eligible to withdraw their contributions if they left the retirement system and most were paid interest on their contributions.

A health insurance program was found to exist in 96 per cent of the institutions surveyed. The only type program found to exist with any kind of nationwide pattern of availability was the Blue Cross Plan (65 per cent). Over 51 per cent of the junior colleges indicated that they paid all or part of the cost of the health insurance program for their faculty members.

A large majority (94 per cent) of the junior colleges reimbursed their faculty members for pro-

(Continued on page 32)

(Continued from page 28)

TABLE I

SUMMARY OF ALL BENEFITS SHOWING RANK ORDER OF THEIR EXISTENCE AND PERCENTAGE OF JUNIOR COLLEGES THAT MADE EACH AVAILABLE

Fringe benefit	Rank order (by frequency)	Junior colleges		
		Yes	No	No response
Retirement	1	99.2	0.8	——
Health insurance	2	96.7	3.3	——
Faculty travel	3	94.3	5.4	0.3
Sick leaves	4	92.3	7.4	0.3
Secretarial assistance	5	91.2	7.4	1.4
Major medical insurance	6	90.7	8.5	0.8[a]
Faculty parking	7	76.9	17.4	5.7
Social Security	8	67.6	31.4	1.0
Leaves without pay	9	65.0	34.2	0.8
Life insurance	10	60.9	37.8	1.3
Leaves with pay	11	52.2	47.8	——
Faculty club	12	34.4	57.1	8.5
Purchases through college	13	20.6	74.8	4.6
Faculty families' education	14	15.9	83.8	0.3
Faculty housing	15	9.5	90.0	0.5
Retired faculty benefits	16	3.3	96.4	0.3
Moving expenses	17	3.1	93.3	3.6
Personal loans	18	2.1	97.4	0.5
Mortgage loans	19	0.8	98.7	0.5
Use of college facilities		[b]	[b]	[b]

[a]Based on N=376 instead of N=389 since this answer was dependent on replies to question about health insurance program.

[b]A composite figure was not available for this benefit since more than one facility was involved.

fessional travel. The two policies that were followed most frequently with reference to the maximum distance a faculty member could travel and be reimbursed was either a no-limit policy or a policy in which reimbursement depended on the meeting. Ninety-two per cent of the junior colleges indicated they followed one of these two policies. Most junior colleges (78 per cent) said there was no limit on the amount a faculty member could be reimbursed for professional travel. The number of trips that could be taken each year varied between those schools that did not have a set policy (44 per cent) and those schools that allowed more than seven trips (30 per cent).

The majority (92 per cent) of the junior colleges had a sick leave program for their faculty members. Most (57 per cent) of the schools stated that their faculty members could earn six to ten days sick leave each year. Fifty-nine per cent of the schools indicated that their faculty members could accumulate more than sixty-one days of sick leave. All of the junior colleges paid their faculty members salary while on sick leave with only 2.6 per cent paying something less than full salary.

The last fringe benefit that appeared in over 90 per cent of the junior colleges was providing secretarial assistance to the faculty members. Most schools (77 per cent) provided their faculty members with a combination of both professional and student assistance. There were some schools (16 per cent) that provided only student secretarial assistance and a few schools (6 per cent) that furnished only professional secretarial help. The majority of all respondents (91 per cent) indicated that the secretarial assistance was available for work only on professional projects and could not be used for any type of personal work.

Additional Benefits

There was a group of frequent benefits that appeared in a majority of all the junior colleges, but not with the consistent regularity of those mentioned previously. These benefits were faculty parking, Social Security, leaves without pay, life insurance, and leaves with pay.

Over one-half (51 per cent) of the junior colleges indicated that on-campus parking was a problem at

their institution. A total of 299 (77 per cent) junior colleges said they reserved parking space on campus for their faculty members with 182 of these schools being included in the group that stated that parking was a problem. Most of the schools reserved parking space for their faculty members on an area basis as opposed to individual spaces.

The fringe benefit of Social Security, while thought to be common to all people, was found to exist in only 263 (67 per cent) junior colleges. A noticeable condition relative to this fringe benefit was that the smaller the institution, the larger percentage of them that covered their faculty under Social Security.

Two hundred thirty-seven (61 per cent) of the junior colleges responding made available a life insurance program for their faculty members. Most of these schools, 233 (94 per cent), offered a group life insurance plan. Some schools additionally made available a group accidental death plan. Over one-half of the respondents (53 per cent) indicated that they did not pay any portion of the premium on any type of life insurance program. One condition that benefited faculty members was that in 88 per cent of the institutions, there was no waiting period to join one of the group plans.

There were 203 (52 per cent) of the junior colleges with a program of leaves with pay. The percentage of affirmative responses indicated that the portion of junior colleges with leaves with pay was increasing since Litton[4] reported 45 per cent in 1964. The most frequent residency for a leave with pay was seven years (50 per cent) with six years required by 26 per cent of the schools. Most junior colleges (76 per cent) indicated they allowed a leave of one year with half pay or one-half year with full pay. The most common stipulation for taking a leave with pay was found to be advanced study. The majority (93 per cent) of the junior colleges required their faculty members to return following a leave with pay with most (60 per cent) obligating the faculty member for two years.

The majority of the junior colleges (65 per cent) made available a program of leaves without pay for their faculty members. The faculty members of most of these junior colleges (71 per cent) were eligible for such a leave after the first three years of teaching and could stay on a leave for 12 months. A majority (53 per cent) of the junior colleges indicated they promoted their faculty who were on a leave without pay and most (91 per cent) said that the faculty member maintained seniority in the school. Only a few of the junior colleges indicated they contributed to the retirement and insurance programs for faculty on leaves without pay.

Benefits Found Infrequently

The last group of benefits included those that existed in only a few of the junior colleges. None of these benefits appeared in more than 34 per cent of the schools and one appeared in less than 1 per cent. This group of benefits included a faculty club, purchases through the college, faculty member's families' education, faculty housing, retired faculty benefits, moving expenses, personal loans, and mortgage loans. One benefit that was not listed in any of these groups was the use of college facilities by the faculty members. It was omitted because it covered several facilities that yielded varied figures, making it impossible to arrive at a composite percentage for the existence of the benefit.

There were 134 junior colleges that had some type of building or space set aside for the faculty members. These "faculty clubs" offered a variety of services. The only one that could be found in a majority (89 per cent) of all clubs was the availability of a lounge. Most of the faculty clubs (77 per cent) had to have some support from the college to operate. Sixty-three per cent of the junior colleges with a faculty club indicated that more than 50 per cent of the faculty utilized the facility.

Eighty (21 per cent) of the junior colleges permitted their faculty members to make purchases through the college at a discount. Most of these schools (51 per cent) reported there was a no-limit policy on the amount that could be purchased through the college, but 97 per cent reported that all purchases through the college had to be made for cash only.

It was found there were 62 (16 per cent) junior colleges that had a program for aiding faculty member's families with their education. This aid amounted, in all cases, to the waiving of tuition for either the spouse or children of a faculty member to attend the college. There were no junior colleges that provided cash grants for the children of faculty members to attend other colleges.

An analysis of all the fringe benefits was made with reference to the size, location, and age of the junior colleges. While a detailed description of this analysis is not included, the basic data are included in Tables II, III, and IV. This information will yield a better insight into the overall picture of fringe benefits by allowing faculty members and administrators to make a comparison of their institution with junior colleges of similar age, size, and location.

Summary and Recommendations

It can be evidenced by the information in this study that the public junior colleges are making available a large number of fringe benefits to their

TABLE II

PERCENTAGE OF JUNIOR COLLEGES, BY SIZE, THAT HAD EACH TYPE OF FRINGE BENEFIT

Type of fringe benefit	Junior colleges, by size						
	1–399 N = 69	400–699 N = 88	700–999 N = 52	1,000–1,999 N = 90	2,000–4,999 N = 65	5,000–up N = 25	All junior colleges N = 389
Retirement	100	98	100	99	100	100	99.2
Health insurance	94	97	96	98	97	100	96.7
Faculty travel	94	97	90	92	95	100	94.3
Sick leaves	86	83	96	97	100	100	92.3
Secretarial assistance	80	89	98	96	92	100	91.2
Major medical insurance	91	88	92	90	90	100	90.7[a]
Faculty parking	57	70	81	82	89	96	76.9
Social Security	93	80	73	63	48	12	67.6
Leaves without pay	52	65	52	61	83	96	65.0
Life insurance	57	62	67	66	55	52	60.9
Leaves with pay	39	40	40	51	77	96	52.2
Faculty club	19	20	35	49	38	64	34.4
Purchases through college	9	17	35	21	20	36	20.6
Faculty family education	14	20	25	10	15	12	15.9
Faculty housing	12	10	17	8	6	—	9.5
Retired faculty benefits	1	5	—	3	8	—	3.3
Moving expenses	1	2	—	2	9	4	3.1
Personal loans	1	—	8	—	3	4	2.1
Mortgage loans	—	1	—	1	2	—	0.8

TABLE III

PERCENTAGE OF JUNIOR COLLEGES, BY LOCATION, THAT HAD EACH TYPE OF FRINGE BENEFIT

Type of fringe benefit	Junior colleges, by location						
	Northeast N = 14	Middle States N = 58	Southern N = 108	North Central N = 125	Western N = 53	Northwest N = 31	All junior colleges N = 38
Retirement	100	100	99	98	100	100	99.2
Health insurance	100	98	100	94	94	97	96.7
Faculty travel	86	100	98	88	96	97	94.3
Sick leaves	93	97	86	94	100	84	92.3
Secretarial assistance	86	98	92	86	96	94	91.2
Major medical insurance	71	98	94	81	98	100	90.7[a]
Faculty parking	71	52	74	81	96	87	76.9
Social Security	50	100	73	70	—	100	67.6
Leaves without pay	57	84	65	50	77	71	65.0
Life insurance	100	69	64	61	57	26	60.9
Leaves with pay	43	81	34	33	89	81	52.2
Faculty club	36	22	44	26	51	32	34.4
Purchases through college	21	14	28	23	9	16	20.6
Faculty family education	21	40	13	15	—	10	15.9
Faculty housing	14	10	11	10	2	13	9.5

[a]Based on N = 376 instead of N = 389 because this answer was dependent on replies to question about health insurance.

TABLE III (Continued)

Retired faculty benefits	—	3	1	7	2	—	3.3
Moving expenses	—	2	1	7	—	3	3.1
Personal loans	21	2	2	1	2	—	2.1
Mortgage loans	—	3	1	—	—	—	0.8

TABLE IV

PERCENTAGE OF JUNIOR COLLEGES, BY AGE, THAT HAD EACH TYPE OF FRINGE BENEFIT

Type of fringe benefit	Junior colleges, by age								
	1900-1910	1911-1920	1921-1930	1931-1940	1941-1950	1951-1960	1961-1965	1966	All junior colleges
	N = 5	N = 25	N = 57	N = 43	N = 49	N = 66	N = 121	N = 23	N = 389
Retirement									
Health insurance	100	100	98	98	100	98	100	100	99.2
Faculty travel	100	92	93	95	100	97	98	100	96.7
Sick leaves	100	92	91	93	100	92	94	100	94.3
Secretarial assistance	100	92	91	88	94	91	90	96	91.2
Major medical insurance	100	87	83	93	96	89	92	91	90.7[a]
Faculty parking	80	84	79	86	82	67	74	78	76.9
Social Security	100	48	72	77	55	61	74	70	67.6
Leaves without pay	60	68	47	63	73	83	64	48	65.0
Life insurance	80	48	53	67	65	65	64	43	60.9
Leaves with pay	100	72	37	40	57	71	50	26	52.2
Faculty club	20	40	23	16	16	15	26	17	20.6
Purchases through college	40	20	23	16	16	15	26	17	20.6
Faculty family education	20	12	7	26	12	20	21	—	15.9
Faculty housing	80	12	21	14	2	6	5	4	9.5
Retired faculty benefits	20	—	5	5	4	—	3	4	3.3
Moving expenses	—	—	2	5	—	6	4	—	3.1
Personal loans	—	—	4	2	4	—	2	—	2.1
Mortgage loans	20	—	—	—	2	2	—	—	0.8

[a]Based on N = 376 instead of N = 389 because this answer was dependent on replies to question about health insurance.

faculty members. Since this was the first nationwide, comprehensive study of fringe benefits in the public junior colleges, there were several facets of the fringe benefit question to which answers could not be sought at this time. These questions, now that a foundation has been established, need to be answered if the junior colleges are going to continue to use fringe benefits as a lever to compete effectively for qualified personnel. These questions include:

1. Which fringe benefits are most desired by faculty members?
2. What is the effect of noninstitutional benefits, such as environmental factors, on a person's decision to teach at a particular institution?
3. What are the fringe benefits for administrators and how do they compare with the findings of this study?

Future studies should provide the answer to these and other questions. When they do, then all junior colleges will have an excellent frame of reference to prepare their fringe benefit programs.

[1]Tickton, Sidney G. *Teaching Salaries Then and Now: A Second Look.* New York: Fund for the Advancement of Education, 1961. p. 7.

[2]Sharpe, Russell T. "Report of the Administration Committee." *Junior College Journal* 29:548-49; May 1959.

[3]Roberts, Clarence W. "A Study of Fringe Benefits of the Full-Time Faculty in the Public Junior Colleges in The United States." (Unpublished dissertation.) Tallahassee: Florida State University, 1967.

[4]Litton, Maurice L. "Results of Sabbatical Leave Survey." *Notes and Announcements of Southwestern Junior College Leadership Program* 5:1; 1965.

Volume 39 ■ October 1968 ■ Number 2

junior college journal

THE MAGAZINE FOR JUNIOR COLLEGE EDUCATION ■ AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF JUNIOR COLLEGES

Roger Yarrington: Editor ■ Catherine H. Mitchell, Molly O. Moffett, and Anna C. Britz: Assistant Editors ■ Thomas T. Gladden: Art Consultant

3 Emphasis—*Program for New Colleges Begins*

5 AAJC Approach ■ *Edmund J. Gleazer, Jr.*

9 Are Our Colleges Really Accessible to the Poor? ■ *Dorothy M. Knoell*

12 Black Power and the Instructional Council ■ *Doris A. Meek*

16 Training the Unemployed ■ *Jack Michie*

18 Escape from the Ghetto at Washtenaw ■ *Robert H. Plummer*

22 The National Shortage of Engineering Technicians ■ *William G. Torpey*

26 A New Leadership Program ■ *Raymond E. Schultz and James L. Wattenbarger*

28 Fringe Benefits in Public Junior Colleges ■ *Clarence W. Roberts*

36 Do We Need a Community College Institute? ■ *Derek S. Singer*

42 Literature in Passing

46 News Backgrounds

60 Credits

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS COPYRIGHTED MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY the author and American Association of Junior Colleges TO ERIC AND ORGANIZATIONS OPERATING UNDER AGREEMENTS WITH THE U.S. OFFICE OF EDUCATION. FURTHER REPRODUCTION OUTSIDE THE ERIC SYSTEM REQUIRES PERMISSION OF THE COPYRIGHT OWNER."

© *Copyright American Association of Junior Colleges 1968*

Officers and Board: Stuart E. Marsee, President, El Camino College ■ Everett M. Woodman, Vice-President, Colby Junior College ■ Edmund J. Gleazer, Jr., Executive Director ■ Donald A. Eldridge, Bennett College ■ Joseph W. Fordyce, Santa Fe Junior College ■ John Lombardi, Los Angeles City School Districts ■ Charles E. Chapman, Cuyahoga Community College ■ Earl J. Klapstein, Mt. Hood College ■ Stephen E. Epler, Fremont-Newark Community College District ■ Charles W. Laffin, Jr., State University of New York Agricultural and Technical College of Farmingdale ■ Clifford G. Erickson, Rock Valley College ■ Frederick C. Ferry, Pine Manor Junior College ■ Rhea M. Eckel, Cazenovia College. **Council on Research and Service:** John W. Dunn, Peralta Junior College District ■ Gail E. Meyers, Monticello College ■ Joe B. Rushing, Tarrant County Junior College District ■ Richard C. Richardson, Jr., Northampton County Area Community College ■ John E. Tirrell. **AAJC Staff:** Edmund J. Gleazer, Jr., Executive Director ■ William G. Shannon, Associate Executive Director ■ James W. White, Director of Finance and Administration ■ William A. Harper, Director of Public Relations ■ John P. Mallan, Director of Governmental Relations ■ Roger Yarrington, Director of Publications ■ Kenneth G. Skaggs, Coordinator of Occupational Education Project ■ Lewis R. Fibel, Specialist in Occupational Education ■ Gilbert D. Saunders, Specialist in Occupational Education ■ James D. Stinchcomb, Specialist in Occupational Education ■ Robert B. Malcolm, Director of Facilities Information Service ■ Dorothy M. Knoell, Coordinator of Urban Community College Project ■ Derek S. Singer, Director of Faculty Development Project ■ Selden C. Menefee, Director of Program with Developing Institutions ■ J. Kenneth Cummiskey, Director of Community Services Project ■ Richard E. Wilson, Director of New Colleges Program ■ Clifton R. Jones, Director of Social Science Project ■ Jack C. Gernhart, Administrative Assistant ■ Richard T. Chinn, Business Manager.

Junior College Journal is published monthly from September through May (December-January issue combined). Subscription: $4.00 per year, 75 cents per copy. Group subscriptions (ten or more) available to junior college faculties and boards of trustees at $1.00 a year. Foreign subscription (excluding PUAS countries) including air mail postage, $10.00 per year. Advertising rates on request. Second class postage paid at Washington, D. C. by the American Association of Junior Colleges; 1315 Sixteenth Street, N. W., Washington 20036. Printed in U.S.A.